

- SPULER, A., 1910. *Die Schmetterlinge Europas*. Stuttgart, II, p. 30.
 STAUDINGER, O., and REBEL, H., 1901. *Catalog der Lepidopteren des Palaearctischen Faunengebietes*. Berlin, p. 281.
 TULLGREN, A., 1941. *Svenska Fjärilar*. Stockholm, p. 239.
 VALLE, K. J., 1946. *Suomen Eläimet Animalia Fennica*. 5 Suurperhoset. IV Geometrae, p. 68.
 VORBRODT, K., and MÜLLER-RUTZ, J., 1914. *Die Schmetterlinge der Schweiz*. Bern, p. 35.
 ZERNY, H., and BEIER, M. (in Kükenthal-Krumbach, *Handbuch der Zoologie, Insecta*—25 Ordnung Lepidoptera), 1936, p. 1711.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR
PURPURA BRUGUIÈRE, 1789. Z.N.(S.) 1621
 (see volume 21, pages 235–239)

By C. O. van Regteren Altena (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

I agree with Dr. Keen that the proposals at the end of her paper present the best solution of the problems she dealt with. For me there is only one exception: I should prefer the family name *Purpuridae* to that of *Thaisidae*, but I must admit that the arguments in favour of these two possibilities practically balance each other.

By Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*La Jolla, California, U.S.A.*)

This application deals with several matters not very closely related, which might better have been submitted separately. I wish to comment upon only one of these, the proposed substitution of the little used family name *THAIDIDAE* for the older and more frequently used name *PURPURIDAE*. I am opposed to this step for the following reasons:

First, the name *PURPURIDAE* is the older of the two, it dates from 1839 in any case, while *THAIDIDAE* originated in 1913, as has been stated.

Secondly, the name *PURPURIDAE* is the commonly accepted name. The name *THAIDIDAE* has never come into general usage.

Third, the old rule was that the family name should be derived from that of the nominate genus, which is *Purpura*. *Thais* at best is not more than a subgenus of *Purpura*. Consequently the use of the family name *THAIDIDAE* might easily result in confusion, since it is derived from a group of only subgeneric rank. It is true that *Thais* was for a while used as a generic name, and the reason for such use should have been accounted for in the application. These are the facts:

The name *Purpura* dates from 1789, as has been correctly stated by the author of the application. When Dall realized that Martyn had used the name *Purpura* in a different sense as early as 1784, he followed the rule that requires that a genus should take the same name as its oldest subgenus and employed *Thais* for the entire genus in the broad sense as well as for the subgenus under it. When the *Universal Conchologist* of Martyn was suppressed availability was restored to *Purpura* Bruguière, 1789, for which reason I would amend Dr. Keen's application, and suppress the unnecessary name *THAIDIDAE*.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE NAME *GARI*
 SCHUMACHER, 1817 Z.N.(S.) 1461

By Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*P.O. Box 1891, La Jolla, California*)

The revised proposals by Dr. Henning Lemche on the problems grouped around the generic name *Gari* Schumacher *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 (5) : 323, 1964, meet with my approval except for one detail. I do not think that the names *Gari* and *Garum* Dall, 1900, should be allowed to co-exist, as they are not different names but only